

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-14 and 21-22, 24, 27-32 and 34 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 21 being the independent claims.

Claims 15-20 were withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention and are hereby sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 23, 25, 26 and 33 are also sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 21, 22, 27-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,575,868 to Keusch et al. ("Keusch"). The Examiner has taken the position that the Keusch patent discloses every element of claims 1 and 21. In particular, the Examiner asserts that a cover plate 83 and an opposing portion of bull gear 52 of the Keusch patent are "holders" as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a common bull gear integrally engaging with a projection formed on each of the holders of the pair of gear train units, wherein the bull gear has a hole into which the projections are inserted." This amendment is fully supported by the specification, for example, at paragraph 39. The Applicant respectfully

submits that the Keusch patent does not disclose "a projection formed on each of the holders . . . wherein the bull gear has a hole into which the projections are inserted," as recited by amended claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 21 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter recited in original claim 23, and claim 23 has therefore been canceled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 22, 27-29 depend from and add features to claims 1 or 21. Accordingly, claims 2-3, 5-7, 22, 27-29 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 21.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Keusch patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,799,403 to Dinkel *et al.* ("Dinkel"). Claim 4 depends from and add features to claim 1. Claim 30 depends from and add features to claim 21. Accordingly, claims 4 and 30 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 21.

Claims 12-14, 25, 26 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Keusch patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,631,475 to Gleasman. Claims 12-14 depend from and add features to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 12-14 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 25, 26 and 33 have been canceled, rendering their rejection moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 21-34 because claim 21 depends from a non-elected invention, and therefore its dependency should be changed. Claims 22-34 depend from and add features to claim 21. Claim 21 has been amended to be in independent form and drawn to an elected invention. Claim 34 has also been amended to change "the deceleration" to --a deceleration -- as required by the Examiner. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-11, 23, 24, 31 and 32 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner indicated that claims 8-11, 23, 24, 31 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8-11 depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Claim 23 has been canceled and its subject matter incorporated into amended claim 21. Claims 24, 31 and 32 depend from independent claim 21 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 21. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Tracy-Gene G. Durkin
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,831

Date: November 22, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

464495_1.DOC